

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 2-11 are pending in this application. Claim 7 is currently amended. Claim 12 is new. In view of the following amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application.

**I. Rejection Under 35 USC § 102**

**A. Claims 2-5**

Claims 2-5 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,409,242 to Chang ("Chang"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Examiner claims that Chang teaches a console lid mounted screen comprising a console lid positioned over a console for pivotal movement relative thereto. The Examiner claims that the console lid of Chang has an interior compartment and a bottom side, and that the console has a storage bin. Furthermore, the Examiner claims that Chang teaches that a display screen is mounted in a movable frame pivotally positioned within the interior compartment of the lid, wherein the movable frame can pivot between at least an open position and a closed position relative to the lid, wherein when the movable frame is in the closed position, the screen is inaccessible. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Chang.

Chang does not show a display screen that is pivotally mounted so that it can pivot relative to the console lid, as described in claim 1 of the present application. The display screen of Chang is pivotally mounted such that it can

pivot relative to the *housing* 24. The housing 24 of Chang is described as being adapted to be secured to the interior of a vehicle roof (Column 3, lines 15-16). This is not equivalent to the mounting of a movable frame to a lid that is also movable. The housing 24 of Chang is not movable, and it does not cover a storage bin.

Furthermore, if the video display 22 is considered a "lid," it does not have the same features as the console lid of the present invention. The console lid of Chang includes the screen and the screen is not pivotable with respect to the lid. The console lid of the present invention contains a screen are one piece mounted within a movable frame that can pivot relative to the lid. This is impossible with the apparatus of Chang, as the console lid and the screen (reference numbers 22 and 50 of Chang), pivot together. Chang simply does not teach a console lid having a display screen mounted in it that pivots relative to the lid. The Examiner is mistakenly equating either the housing of Chang with the lid of the present invention, or the console lid and screen combination of Chang with the movable frame mounted in the console lid of the present invention. Under either interpretation, Chang does not disclose each and every feature claimed in claim 2 of the present invention, nor is there a suggestion to modify Chang to create such an apparatus. In order to do so, Chang would have to be modified so that the housing actually pivoted open as well, and since the housing of Chang is designed to be mounted on the roof of the interior of the

vehicle, there would be no reason for it to do so. Therefore, claim 2 is allowable and Applicant respectfully requests that the §102(e) rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3-6 are dependent on allowable claim 2, and therefore are believed to be allowable as well.

**II. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

**A. Claim 6**

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,494,447 to Zaidan ("Zaidan"). Applicant respectfully traverses.

The Examiner states that Chang teaches self-tensioning hinges, but not pinions, and that Zaidan teaches the use of a pinion to help a display part to remain stationary at any angle relative to a base part. The combination of Chang and Zaidan does not disclose each and every feature of claim 2, and claim 6 is dependent on claim 2. As previously described, Chang does not teach, nor would it obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Chang to construct an apparatus having a pivotable screen mounted in a pivotable lid. Therefore, claim 6 is allowable, and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

**B. Claims 7-11**

Claims 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,276,589 to Bartlett et al. ("Bartlett") in view of

Zaidan. The Examiner states that Bartlett teaches a frame pivotally attached to a console lid, a display screen defined within the frame, and the console lid having a compartment defined therein to receive the frame, but does not teach a friction pinion. The Examiner states that Zaidan teaches the use of a pinion to help a display part remain stationary at any angle relative to a base part. The Examiner claims that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the pinion as taught by Zaidan with the console lid mounted screen as taught by Bartlett. The Examiner states that he has considered Applicant's arguments filed on June 23, 2003, but does not find them persuasive. The Examiner states that Applicant's argument that the pinion described in Zaidan is not the same as the pinion device of the present application is not supported by the specification. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Claim 7 has been further amended to better define the present invention by adding the phrase "said friction pinion extending from said frame, said friction pinion allowing said frame to be rotatable around a single axis." This amendment is supported by Figure 2 of the specification, which clearly shows this arrangement of the friction pinion. Each pinion extends from a side of the movable frame, and each pinion is a simple rod shape. This arrangement allows the frame to rotate around a single axis. Zaidan's complex hinge assemblies include an arm that is nothing like the pinion claimed in amended claim 7, and shown in Figure 2. Even if the arm is arguably a pinion that extends from the

side of one component of the apparatus, the design of Zaidan is such that the arm has two right angles defined thereon, allowing the components to rotate around more than one axis each. In fact, rotating around a single axis is expressly defined in Zaidan as a shortcoming of the conventional hinge arrangements. (Column 1, lines 59-66). This is not similar to the friction pinion of the present invention. Furthermore, nothing in Zaidan would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to make a modification such that the arm only allows rotation about one axis, since Zaidan expressly teaches away from such an arrangement.

Furthermore, in order to combine the arm of Zaidan with the frame and console of Barnett, the design of Barnett would have to be drastically changed to accommodate the arm. But, even if Bartlett and Zaidan were combined, the resulting apparatus would not allow the frame to rotate about a single axis, as claimed in amended claim 7. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of claim 7 be withdrawn. Claims 8-11 are dependent on allowable amended claim 7, and are therefore believed to be allowable as well.

**III. New Claim 12**

Applicant has added new claim 12 to further define the present invention. Claim 12 is dependent on amended claim 7, which is believed to be allowable. Claim 12 simply describes the use of at least two friction pinions, one extending from each side of the frame. This new claim is supported in Figure 2, which


Appl. No. 09/823,587  
Amdt. dated November 19, 2003  
Reply to Office action of September 25, 2003

shows two such pinions. As claim 12 is dependent on amended claim 7, which is believed to be allowable, claim 12 is believed to be allowable as well.

**IV. Conclusion**

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome each of the rejections. The application is therefore in condition for allowance. If, for any reason, the Examiner believes that the amendments and remarks do not put the claims in condition for allowance, the undersigned attorney can be reached at (312) 245-5394 to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Justin B. Rand', is written over a horizontal line.

Justin B. Rand  
Registration No. 48,552

Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200